EXHIBIT F

Volume 19

Pages 2897 - 3052

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON, JUDGE

IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT-PANEL))
ANTITRUST LITIGATION.) NO. C 07-MDL-1827 SI

San Francisco, California Monday August 26, 2013 8:58 a.m. Individual Cases: CASE NO. 10-CV-4572 CASE NO. 12-CV-4114

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Best Buy Plaintiffs:

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI LLP

2049 Century Park East

Suite 3400

Los Angeles, California 90067

BY: ROMAN M. SILBERFELD, ESQ.

DAVID MARTINEZ, ESQ. LAURA E. NELSON, ESQ. BERNICE CONN, ESQ.

MICHAEL A. GEIBELSON, ESQ.

For Defendant HannStar Display Corporation:

FREITAS TSENG & KAUFMAN, LLP

100 Marine Parkway

Suite 200

Redwood Shores, California 94065

BY: ROBERT E. FREITAS, ESQ.

JASON SHEFFIELD ANGELL, ESQ. JESSICA NICOLE LEAL, ESQ.

(Appearances continued, next page)

APPEARANCES, CONTINUED:

For Toshiba Defendants:

WHITE & CASE LLP

701 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

BY: CHRISTOPHER M. CURRAN, ESQ.

JOHN H. CHUNG, ESQ.
J. MARK GIDLEY ESQ.
MICHAEL HAMBURGER, ESQ.
HEATHER BURKE, ESQ.
MARTIN TOTO, ESQ.

Also Present: Naomi Kusakabe

Alex Tsai Paul Chiu

William Johnson Julius Christensen

Reported by: BELLE BALL, CSR #8785, CRR, RDR

CONNIE KUHL, CSR #13173, RMR, CRR

Official Reporters, U.S. District Court

o'clock. I have no idea about the cross. But I don't have 2 another witness until Dr. Bernheim comes tomorrow morning at 3 8:30, largely because of the change of the schedule that we 4 had. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 MR. SILBERFELD: I just wanted to point that out. 7 MR. CURRAN: That could be a problem, your Honor, because we all -- I think we all want to conclude by the end 8 9 of the day tomorrow. And if there's a gap, that could threaten that situation. I don't know what the change of the 10 schedule Mr. Silberfeld was referring to, but.... 11 12 MR. SILBERFELD: We were supposed to be dark these 1.3 two days and we planned around this, and when those days came back on the calendar -- that's the schedule I'm talking about. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. We'll just see how it goes. 16 MR. CURRAN: Okay. 17 (Recess taken from 12:01 to 12:50 p.m.) **DEPUTY CLERK:** Come to order. 18 19 THE COURT: You may be seated. 2.0 Is it correct that as to the motion concerning damage 2.1 figures, defendant's trial brief to exclude Best Buy's experts 22 from testifying to new damage figures on rebuttal -- there's 23 been no written opposition to that, right? 24 MR. SILBERFELD: Right. That was filed this morning. 25 THE COURT: Okay. As to the one, Best Buy's motion

```
to allow evidence related to duplicative discovery by the
 2
    consumer class under the Minnesota Antitrust Act, the Court's
 3
    ruling will be that Mr. Frankel cannot testify to the jury
 4
    about any of these things. I will give instructions at the
 5
    end of the trial, together with all the other instructions,
 6
    about damages. And if and to the extent it's appropriate
 7
    after trial that you take further evidence from him, we can
    talk about it.
8
9
             MR. SILBERFELD: Okay.
              THE COURT: So that's that.
10
        Now, with respect to the damage figures, what do you
11
12
    propose that I do about that?
             MR. SILBERFELD: Well, the objection, as I understand
13
    it, is that the damage figures are different.
14
15
              THE COURT: Right.
16
             MR. SILBERFELD: And they are different.
17
             THE COURT: And they are different.
18
             MR. SILBERFELD: They are different. They are lower.
19
    They are lower, for two principal reasons:
2.0
        One, the Court ruled -- and I don't recall the exact
2.1
    date -- about various NEC entities. Those NEC entities were
22
    in the direct purchase claim. They came out of there.
23
    Dr. Bernheim's figures went from about $285 million to about
24
    282, or 283.
              THE COURT:
25
                          That already happened.
```

1 MR. SILBERFELD: That already happened. 2 damages then become indirect in nature. And they were added 3 in to Dr. Frankel's damage figures, causing those damage 4 figures to go up slightly. But the total damage figure 5 doesn't change as between the two claims. 6 The other thing that happened is that there were, I think, 7 five very, very small firms where the linking up, if you will, of their role in the conspiracy did not happen in the course 8 9 of our case in chief. And we instructed both Dr. Bernheim and Dr. Frankel to remove any damages associated with those firms 10 from their damage figures. 11 12 THE COURT: Which they are prepared to do, but have 1.3 not yet done? 14 MR. SILBERFELD: Have done. 15 THE COURT: Have they done it in trial here? 16 Already? 17 MR. SILBERFELD: No. 18 THE COURT: No, but they're --19 MR. SILBERFELD: They're about to. 2.0 THE COURT: Yes. Okay. 2.1 MR. SILBERFELD: And the Court may recall the 22 testimony of both Bernheim and Frankel to the effect that: 23 It's an easy mechanical thing to do. Does not change the 24 model; does not change the program. 25 THE COURT: Yes.

1 MR. SILBERFELD: And we provided not only the new 2 figures, but the backup information as to how to run the 3 various models to check the result, if you will. And I 4 believe we've provided that to counsel last Thursday. 5 MR. GIDLEY: If I may, your Honor? 6 THE COURT: Briefly, yes. 7 MR. GIDLEY: Your Honor, it's not a matter of mere addition. Dr. Bernheim's number went down 5 million. But 8 9 Dr. Frankel's number goes up 6.2 million. So they're not dollar-for-dollar. This isn't just a row from a chart. 10 Dr. Frankel, we're talking about four or five different 11 12 computer programming runs that you have to do. For 1.3 Dr. Bernheim, when we asked for the backup, this is what we 14 got, Saturday night at 8:00 p.m. -- I can hand it up if you 15 want to see it. I know you've got three feet with you of 16 paper, but it's another foot -- another inch of paper with 17 various computer program runs. 18 For Dr. Bernheim, it's 30 different programming changes, 19 so it's not mere arithmetic. For Dr. Frankel, Dr. Frankel's 2.0 backup is something like four or five different computer runs. 2.1 Our point is very simple. We're in rebuttal. It's not in 22 their report. If you got all of this dumped on you in 23 discovery, you'd want a deposition. That's the only way to 24 cut through all this. There's something fishy when 25 Dr. Bernheim gets rid of NEC and gives it over to Dr. Frankel

and it's not dollar-for-dollar. 2 THE COURT: Yes, and what you're doing now is 3 arguing, and that's fine. There's going to be plenty of time 4 to argue. I understand your argument. I might even be 5 persuaded by it, but I don't think it's a reason to disallow 6 the testimony. So the motion to keep it out, if that's what 7 it was, is denied; or the motion to let it in, if that's what 8 it was, is granted. 9 But you may fully explore all of the things you just talked about with the witness. 10 MR. GIDLEY: Thank you, your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 1.3 Are we ready? 14 MR. SILBERFELD: Ready to go. 15 (The jury enters the courtroom) 16 (The following proceedings were held in the presence of 17 the Jury) 18 THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. You 19 may all be seated. 2.0 All right. Plaintiffs may call their next witness. 2.1 MR. SILBERFELD: Thank you, your Honor. Plaintiff 22 recalls Dr. Alan Frankel. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. CURRAN: Your Honor, Mr. Toto will handle this 25 witness for Toshiba.

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTERS

I, BELLE BALL, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/ Belle Ball Belle Ball

Monday, August 26, 2013

I, CONNIE KUHL, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/ Connie Kuhl_____

Monday, August 26, 2013